DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 224 SP 034 221

AUTHOR Pellow, Randall A.; Kuhns, Polly
TITLE Program Quality Assessment in Pennsylvania.
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability; Admission Criteria; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Quality; Education Majors; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; *Program Evaluation; Student Characteristics; Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS External Evaluation; *Pennsylvania; *Quality Indicators

ABSTRACT

Pennsylvania does not have a legislatively mandated program in place for assessing teacher education programs in institutions of higher education. This study was conducted to examine how Pennsylvania's public and private universities and colleges assess the quality of their teacher education programs. Deans and/or chairs of teacher education programs from all higher education institutions in the state were contacted by the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching. Participants (23 institutions), selected at random, responded to a survey instrument designed to investigate assessment procedures used in determining quality of teacher education programs. Findings indicate: scholastic aptitude test scores and high school class standing are the two largest determinants for accepting students; internally derived factors are perceived to be more important than externally derived processes; and greater emphasis has been placed on more traditional, quantitative measures than on qualitative indices. Tabular results, recommendations, and an extensive bibliography are included. Appendices consist of copies of the survey instrument, the letter introducing the project, responses to the survey instrument; and comments from respondents. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353224

PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA

Dr. Randall A. Pellow
Professor of Teacher Education
Shippensburg University

Dr. Polly Kuhns
Associate Professor of Educational Administration
Shippensburg University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Pellow

P Kuhns

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching
September 1992

SP 034 221

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

During the last decade, there have been unprecedented efforts to strengthen this nation's schools. Agitation throughout the educational arena for what is now popularly known as the **school reform movement** was initiated by the landmark publication A Nation At-Risk (1983), and shaped more recently by reports from the Holmes Group (1986), the Carnegie Foundation (1988), and the burgeoning literature.

Some critics in basic education argued for changes to occur within the schools (K-12). Smaller class size and more instructional resources to enhance the quality of teaching, rather than expanding the teacher's initial preparation, were recommended by many.

Some reformers such as the Holmes Group pleaded for political/programmatic changes at institutions of higher education. They advocated postbaccalaureate teacher preparation and the enhancement of the professional status of teachers. They discerned a "confederation as a more viable strategy for improving teacher education than single institutions moving independently of one another . . . ." (Howey and Zimpher, 1989, p. 3) and a hierarchial career ladder that would acknowledge different professional levels. In addition, a manifestation of postbaccalaureate training was the politically mandated induction or mentoring program.

Some reformers advocated revisions and extensions to the undergraduate program focusing more upon curricula changes. These critics emphasized changing the nature of pedagogy and teaching effectiveness, and redesigning general education as well as professional core courses.

Other critics argued for a fifth year of training extending teacher training programs into graduate level work. The American Association of American Colleges for Teacher Education (AAACTE) identified seven alternative paradigms for extended teacher preparation programs (Howey and Zimpher, 1989, p. 4).

Howey and Zimpher (1989) offered an overview of the current issues over teacher education. They succinctly amalgamated the dichotomy between basic and higher education by citing, "Recent concerns over our nation's schools and the quality of teaching within them have translated into questions of who prepares our teachers, in what manner, and how well?" (p. 1).

The public education system in the United States is a huge enterprise employing over two million teachers in eighty-three thousand schools (Johnston and Others, 1989, p. 8). Whether one's concern is basic education (schools housing grades K-12), teachers, or teacher education programs in higher education, the permutations of variables to be explored makes for an exceedingly complex problem.

Indeed, there is so much fervor and agitation in the literature over teaching and teacher education that terms such as "brouhaha", "firefight", and "shootout" were used to characterize the dissension within the reform movement.

Statement of the Problem

Pennsylvania does not have a legislatively mandated program assessment in place. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine how Pennsylvania's institutions of higher education assess the quality of their teacher education programs. More specifically, this study answered the following questions:

1. What sources are used for students' admissions into universities and colleges in Pennsylvania?
2. What processes are used within institutions of higher education to evaluate teacher education programs?
3. What measures of students' abilities are used to evaluate quality in teacher education programs?
4. What student summative assessment data are used to evaluate teacher education programs
5. What factors are perceived to contribute to the overall quality of teacher education programs?
6. What external review agencies are used to evaluate teacher education programs?

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Methodology

Many states throughout the nation have mandated assessment programs for institutions of higher education. Pennsylvania is not one of the states where such a program has been legislatively determined (Cooper, letter Aug. 6, 1991). Due to the number of institutions in Pennsylvania, the large number of Instructional I Certificates (issued yearly) and the litany of research, the significance of assessment, as related to program quality of teacher education, has become paramount.

Therefore, it was the intent of the researchers to examine assessment issues directly related to Pennsylvania institutions of higher education. Due to the multiple dimensions associated with assessment, it was determined by an Advisory Committee to the Academy that Phase I of this project would be to determine the ways colleges and universities in Pennsylvania assess the quality of teacher education programs. The additional phases needed to further investigate this issue have not been determined. Therefore, this section addresses the methodology utilized to carry out the investigation of Phase I.

Sites and Subjects

The state of Pennsylvania is the location of a myriad of institutions of higher education. Within its boundaries are 85 private institutions, five state-related/aided institutions and 14 state institutions. During the 1990-91 year, these institutions granted 10,269 Instructional I certificates. In order to investigate the quality of these teacher education programs, a sample of university types was chosen as the units of investigation. These institutions represent approximately 80% to 85% of teachers being certified on an annual basis. All 14 universities of the SSHE, 3 of the state-related/aided institutions and 11 of the private institutions were targeted. Using the table of random numbers, 11 private colleges or universities were randomly selected from a total population of 85. The deans and/or chairs of the teacher education programs from the selected universities or colleges were the respondents of the survey instrument.

Instrumentation

The survey research method was chosen as the means to investigate the assessment procedures used to determine the quality of teacher education programs in Pennsylvania. The survey instrument reflected the processes used by colleges and universities to assess quality from both internal and external sources. These sources were selected from

pertinent college catalogs and from the current literature on assessment procedures in higher education.

In total, the survey consisted of twenty-one items and followed questionnaire and opinionnaire formats. The survey was subdivided into five distinct parts with each one containing multiple-itemed questions. Part I pertained to factors that related to teacher education program evaluation. The responses were categorized according to elementary and secondary programs. Part II addressed admissions criteria into colleges and universities and criteria for entrance into teacher education programs. Part III was concerned with student teaching prerequisites. Part IV dealt with institutional information. Part V referred to the perceptions of the respondents and their perceived opinions of their faculty on factors that contribute to the quality of teacher education programs. The survey also contained space for comments.

A large portion of time regarding survey construction was spent formating the design. Applicable columns were computer drawn and labeled accordingly. This effort was for the purpose of visual clarity and organization.

Validation of the survey instrument was sought from experienced professionals. They were: Dr. Judy Brough, Chair of the Educational Administration Department of a private liberal arts college; Dr. Audrey Sprenger, former Director of an NCATE evaluation team; Dr. Robert Bartos,

Dean of Education and Human Services at a SSHE institution; Dr. Walt Konetschni, Chair/Professor of Sociology; Dr. Mary Cooper, former Project Director of the Pennsylvania Academy; and an Advisory Committee. Revisions were made according to suggestions. Finally, the instrument was titled "Program Quality Assessment Survey in Teacher Education in Pennsylvania." See Appendix A.

Procedures

Permission was granted from the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching on June 3, 1991 to conduct the study. Prior to approval, a proposal was submitted which detailed the goals of the project. The proposal delineated and calendarized the specifics of the investigation using the context, input, process, and product (CIPP) evaluation model. The model specifically outlined the objectives and time frames necessary for the study's completion.

From the onset, the researchers worked directly with the Executive Director and Project Director of the Academy, Dr. Susan Arisman and Dr. Mary Cooper, respectively, and members of the Pennsylvania Academy's Advisory Committee. Two meetings were held with this committee to discuss the intent of the research and to validate the assessment instrument. In addition, several other meetings were

conducted with the Project Director during the construction of the instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

Following the construction, validation, and printing of the instrument, the surveys were sorted and precoded for mailing. The coding occurred for identification so that follow-up telephone interviews might be arranged, if necessary. A cover letter from the Academy was written and sent along with the survey to the identified institutions. (See Appendix B). The coding and mailing was handled by the Academy for efficiency, cost, and anonymity. The surveys were to be returned to the Academy by mid-September, 1991.

Prior to analyses, the questions were categorized according to process and product aspects of teacher education programs. The categorization was done individually by the researchers and the Project Director, and then, ranked jointly in a following meeting. There was high agreement among the items. If calculated, the research team would have achieved high interrater reliability.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Method of Analysis

In September 1991, The Program Quality Assessment Survey Instrument was sent to fourteen SSHE institutions, five state-related/aided institutions, and eleven randomly chosen private institutions. Survey responses were received from 23 of the 30 institutions that were sent surveys for a total 77% return rate. Of the 23, ten were from the State System of Higher Education, three from the state-related/aided institutions, and 10 from the private institutions. There were 21 institutions with elementary teacher education programs and 23 institutions with secondary teacher education programs. Data were tabulated and analyzed collectively to preserve the anonymity of the respective institutions.

Working under the direction of Dr. Tom Austin, statistician and Professor of Criminal Justice at Shippensburg University, a graduate assistant created a codebook for tallying the data on SPSS' Statistical Program. There was a total of 21 items plus a "Comments" section to be analyzed. Because of the dichotomy between elementary and secondary programs and the multi-responses for some items, responses were coded and categorized accordingly. Thus, there was a total of 110 items that were analyzed. Data were tabulated and analyzed according to the number of

responses, the percentage of respondents, and mean scores (where applicable). (See Appendix C).

Results of Data Analysis

Many of the results are reported using tables. However, not all of the significant data were placed in tabular format. Thus, the results reflect information extracted from the tables and information expressed separately in the narrative. In addition, such information is presented sequentially to address the questions upon which this study was based.

Table One cites admission criteria reported by colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. Such findings reflect the dichotomous structure of the sample and therefore separately address elementary and secondary programs. Of the total number of institutions (n=23) that responded, 21 had teacher education programs in elementary education and all 23 had secondary programs.

Both programs showed that the Scholastic Aptitude Test and high school class standing were the two largest determinants for accepting students into Pennsylvania colleges and universities. More specifically, 87% of the secondary teacher education programs cited these two criteria as a priority whereas in the elementary programs, 86% and 81% respectively, were reported. Another admission criterion, high school grade point average, was used by 12

Table One

Admissions Criteria Into Universities and Colleges

	Elementary (n=21)	%	Secondary (n=23)	%
Scholastic Aptitude Test	18	86%	20	87%
High School Class Standing	17	81%	20	87%
High School Grade Point Average	12	57%	15	65%
High School Portfolios	4	19%	4	18%
Admissions Interview	8	38%	8	35%

Table Two

Internal Processes Used to Evaluate Teacher Education Programs in PA

	Elementary (n=21)	%	Secondary (n= 23)	%
Faculty Committee Evaluation	19	90%	21	91%
Evaluation Policy Guidelines	15	71%	17	74%
Faculty Evaluations of Quality	16	76%	18	78%
Student Evaluations are Used	19	90%	21	91%

institutions (57%) with elementary programs and 15 institutions (65%) with secondary programs. Eight institutions (35%) with secondary programs and 8 institutions (38%) with elementary programs used admissions interview as an additional criterion for entrance, while only 18% (n = 4) and 19% (n = 4)of the institutions, respectively, utilized high school portfolios.

Additional data regarding SAT scores were collected. Twelve institutions (52%) reported cutoff scores ranging between 800 and 1199. Nine institutions (39%) chose the response "not applicable" which possibly indicated the use of SATs but having no cutoff score.

Regarding admissions into teacher education programs, most colleges and universities had separate entrance requirements. Only 22% of the secondary programs and 14% of the elementary programs used a 2.0 - 2.49 grade criterion, whereas 74% and 76% respectively, utilized a grade point average of 2.5 or higher. In addition, 14 elementary programs (67%) and 16 secondary programs (70%) required "approval by the Dean of Education." Disparity of results existed with an "interview committee;" only 5 schools with elementary programs (24%) used them whereas 16 schools with secondary programs (76%) found them to be necessary.

Table Two demonstrates those assessment processes used within institutions to evaluate teacher education programs. "Faculty committees" and "student evaluations" were used in

Table Three

Measures of Student Abilities Used
in Program Evaluation

	Elementary (n=21)	%	Secondary (n=23)	%
Organize or formulate curriculum	19	90%	21	91%
Make subject matter comprehensible	20	95%	21	91%
Adapt content and instruction to learners	20	95%	22	96%
Assess learning	20	95%	22	96%
Use assessment to organize instruction	20	95%	22	96%
Work with students of diverse backgrounds	19	90%	20	87%
Set goals for professional development	14	67%	16	70%

Table Four

Summative Assessment Data Used in Program Evaluation

	Elementary (n=21)	%	Secondary (n=23)	%
graduation ratios	12	57%	15	65%
employment ratios	17	81%	19	83%
student performance on exit exams	9	43%	10	43%
student exit interviews	12	57%	13	57%
student portfolios	8	38%	10	43%
graduates of the program	20	95%	23	100%
teachers in field with whom the student worked	21	100%	23	100%
school district administrators	18	86%	20	87%
other sources	7	33%	7	30%

19 colleges and universities (90%) with elementary programs and in 21 institutions (91%) with secondary programs. "Faculty evaluations" were used in 16 (76%) and 18 colleges (78%) with elementary and secondary programs, respectively.

Another internal source of assessment was the "significance of an internal self study." Twenty institutions with elementary programs (88%) rated the self study as "highly" or "very highly" significant factor to program quality whereas 18 institutions with secondary programs (78%) ranked self study similarly.

Table Three reveals a variety of student abilities that were used in determining program quality. Respondents were asked to indicate the presence or absence of student performance in regard to curricular features in assessing quality of teacher education programs. Such features pertained to abilities in organizing or formulating curriculum, adapting content and instruction to learners, assessing learning, and so on. The values ranged from 67% to 95% for elementary programs and 70% to 96% for secondary programs.

Table Four depicts summative assessment data used to evaluate teacher education programs. Measures such as "student performance on exit exams" (43%), "student exit interviews" (57%), and "student portfolios" (38% for elementary programs and 43% for secondary programs) were

reported. Over 81% of the institutions used employment ratios data in their program evaluations.

In non-tabular form, it was reported that nine institutions, or almost 40%, had an average employment ratio below 80% for the last three years. Four institutions, or 17%, had an employment ratio above 90% within the field of teaching. Also in non-tabular form, 16 institutions, or 69%, had an average percentage for the last three years of greater than 90% of their students pass all four sections of the NTE. In contrast, 2 respondents, or 9%, rated the NTE "very highly" or "highly" as a valid indicator for contributing to the quality of teacher education programs.

Additional assessment information was obtained by institutions from graduates, cooperating teachers, and school district administrators. In particular, 100% of the respondents reported obtaining feedback from cooperating teachers about the quality of their teacher education programs.

Table Five refers to factors which contribute to overall quality of teacher education programs (Appendix C, Question 21). A 12 item Q-Sort type of response was used to ascertain the perceptions of school deans' and/or directors of teacher education programs. The beliefs were ranked according to the most important and least important factors that contributed to the overall quality of their teacher education programs. Mean responses were calculated based

Table Five
Perceived Importance of Factors That Contribute
to Quality of Teacher Education Programs

Rank	Mean
3	1.22 A) motivation and desire of the students
2	1.17 B) program curriculum
10	2.30 C) overall grade point average of the students
7.5	1.87 D) grade point average in the students' major
6	1.83 E) student teaching grade or performance (if on pass/fail)
5	1.61 F) academic credentials of the education faculty
1	1.09 G) academic quality of faculty instruction
12	2.96 H) induction program within school districts
11	2.91 I) evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE
7.5	1.87 J) collaboration with school districts
9	2.13 K) class size
4	1.52 L) articulation across program components: i. e. general education, arts and sciences, professional education, field experience/ student teaching.

upon a five point scale. The four most important perceived factors were ranked: 1) academic quality of faculty instruction, 2) program curriculum, 3) motivation and desire of the students, and 4) articulation across program components. Two factors perceived as least important were "evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE" ranked 11 out of 12 and "induction programs" which ranked last.

Table Six examines those features from external sources of assessment. Most notably were the NCATE, Middle States, and PDE evaluations of program features.

It appeared that 10 institutions, or 43%, did not use the NCATE process as a means of assessing their teacher education programs. Of the 13 institutions that use the NCATE process, 6 institutions, or 46%, considered that process to contribute "very highly" or "highly" to the overall quality of teacher education programs.

Regarding the significance of NCATE and Middle States evaluation processes, respondents' values for "highly" or "very highly" were 26% (6 schools), whereas the respondents' perceived opinions of their faculty ranged from 39% for NCATE and 26% for Middle States.

In reference to the PDE evaluation, 17 institutions (74%) ranked the process "highly" or "very highly" whereas respondents' perceived opinion of their faculty were recorded slightly lower at 65% (15 institutions).

Table Six
Program Features from External Sources
of Assessment

How significantly does the NCATE process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

	Respondent	Respondent Perceived Opinion of Faculty
Not applicable	10 (43%)	10 (43%)
slightly	2 (9%)	4 (17%)
moderately	5 (22%)	5 (22%)
highly	2 (9%)	4 (17%)
very highly	4 (17%)	

How significantly does the Middle States process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

	Respondent	Faculty Opinion
Not applicable	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
slightly	7 (30%)	8 (35%)
moderately	9 (39%)	8 (35%)
highly	4 (17%)	5 (22%)
very highly	2 (9%)	1 (4%)

How significantly does the Pennsylvania Department of Education process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

	Respondent	Faculty Opinion
Not applicable		
slightly	2 (9%)	4 (17%)
moderately	4 (17%)	4 (17%)
highly	9 (39%)	6 (26%)
very highly	8 (35%)	9 (39%)

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

1. Of the institutions offering elementary and secondary programs, 17 institutions (81%) and 20 institutions (87%) for elementary and secondary programs place high priority upon Scholastic Aptitude Test scores and high school class standing for accepting students in Pennsylvania colleges and universities. Least used admission criteria were admissions interview and high school portfolios, respectively. (Table One)
2. Regarding program evaluation, the two most frequently used features were faculty committee evaluations and student evaluations (90% and 91%, respectively). (Table Two)
3. A variety of students' competencies were reported in assessing program quality among the institutions surveyed. These competencies addressed curricular features such as abilities to organize and formulate curriculum, assess learning, adopt content and instruction to learners, and so on. Respondents used six out of seven competencies over 90% of the time to assess program quality. (Table Three)
4. Student performance on exit exams, student exit interviews, student portfolios and employment ratios

were used to gather summative data on teacher education program evaluation. However, the most effective source was found to be cooperating teachers. (Table Four)

5. Four factors perceived as most important contributors to the overall quality of teacher education programs were 1) academic quality of faculty instruction, 2) program curriculum, 3) motivation and desire of the students, and 4) articulation across program component. Two factors perceived as least important to quality were evaluations from external agencies (outside the system) and induction programs. None of the twelve items was perceived to be an unimportant contributor to program quality. (Table Five)
6. NCATE, PDE, and Middle States were three external agencies used to evaluate program quality. Of the three external agencies, PDE was perceived to have the greatest effect on overall program quality. (Table Six)
7. Six of 22 institutions (27%) considered the Middle States evaluation process to contribute "very highly" or "highly" to the overall quality of teacher education programs.
8. Seventeen out of 23 institutions, or 74%, considered the PDE process to contribute "highly" or "very highly" to the overall quality of teacher education programs.

9. The respondents felt their faculty did not perceive external agencies to be as important in contributing to overall program quality as they did.

Conclusions

Measures for admissions into colleges and universities and into teacher education programs appear to be more quantitative than qualitative. The data suggest that scholastic aptitude test scores and high school class standing are the two largest determinants for accepting students in Pennsylvania colleges and universities. The selection criteria of portfolios and admissions interviews received a much lower rating even though the current literature suggests a greater emphasis on qualitative measures for selection to PA university and colleges.

As they relate to assessing the quality of teacher education programs, the data suggest that internally derived factors are perceived to be more important than externally derived processes. The one major exception was the external-oriented agency of PA Department of Education.

However, the data were inconsistent regarding the perceived importance that external agencies have upon the quality of teacher education programs. While the deans and/or directors of teacher education programs ranked the "evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE" as being, on the average, an unimportant factor with respect

to their contributions to the quality of teacher education programs, they rated the PDE evaluation process, an external agency, quite highly. It is possible that many officials at institutions did not want to pay the NCATE fee or did not have the PDE in mind when answering this question.

Although assessment of higher education is not mandated in Pennsylvania, the data suggest that assessment is certainly in the mainstream of thinking. The results reflected a variety of assessment mechanisms on program evaluation in teacher education for students, faculty, and administration. The results showed a greater frequency with the more traditional, quantitative measures than qualitative indices. The next phase needs to focus on quality

Recommendations

1. Further research is needed on ways to collect data on how teacher education programs are assessed.
2. In-depth interviews should be conducted on what is and what is not helpful in the program evaluation process.
3. A small research team needs to be formed to focus on and coordinate dissemination efforts based upon the results of projects and studies.
4. There needs to be stronger networking between program evaluation processes in teacher education programs and the Chapter 49 regulations that are currently being reviewed and reformulated. The Pennsylvania State Board

of Education's Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification has devised 14 policy questions to serve as focal points in revising these regulations.

5. Because of differential expectations, it is absolutely essential that upcoming reform efforts be more strongly correlated between higher education and basic education. In order for more meaningful reform efforts to occur, school-university partnerships should be inextricably linked so that prospective teachers are inexorably linked to the teaching-learning-assessment process. Accordingly, several paradigms of university teacher educators working in a participatory fashion with basic education teachers and schools need to be designed, field-tested, and revised.
6. An assessment model of program evaluation for teacher education programs needs to be constructed, revised, and implemented.

REFERENCE LIST - QUALITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Books

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1992). Rate V teaching teachers: Facts and figures. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1990). Rate IV teaching teachers: Facts and figures. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1991). Resource review: Assessment issues in teacher education (1983-1990). ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.: Author.

Bey, T.M. & Holmes, C.T. (Eds.). (1990). Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990c). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J.I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (Eds.). (1990). Places where teachers are taught. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Herbst, J. (1989). And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Holtz, H., Marcus, I., Dougherty, J., Michaels, J., & Peduzzi, R. (Eds.). (1989). Education and the American dream. (Critical Studies in Education Series), Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Howey, K.R. and Zimpher, N.L. (1989). Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Johnson, R., Prus, J., Andersen, C.J., & El-Khawas, E. (1991). Assessing Assessment. Higher Education Panel Report Number 79, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Johnston, J.S., Jr. & Associates. (1989). Those Who Can: Undergraduate programs to prepare arts and sciences majors for teaching. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980s. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

National Commission of Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Odell, S.J. (1990). Mentor teacher programs. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Sarason, S.B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sarason, S.B., Davidson, K.S., & Blatt, B. (1986). The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem in education (rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books, Inc.

Sears, J.T. & Marshall, J. D. (Eds.). (1990). Teaching and thinking about curriculum: Critical inquiries. New York: Teachers College Press.

Toombs, W. & Tierney, W. (1992). Meeting the mandate: Renewing the college and department curriculum. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports 91-6, Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.

Journal Articles

Aksamit, D., Hall, S.P. & Ryan, L. (1990). Naturalistic inquiry applied to the evaluation of a teacher education program. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6(3), 215-226.

Altschuld, J.W. (1991). This issue. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 2.

Altschuld, J.W. & Thomas, P.M. (1991). The teaching of evaluation: 25 years of growth and change. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 22-29.

Apple, M.W. (1990). Is there a curriculum voice to reclaim? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 526-530.

Barth, R.S. (1990). A personal vision of a good school. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 512-516.

Bowers, J.J. (1991). Evaluating testing programs at the state and local levels. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 52-60.

Boyer, E. (1991). Challenge for the 1990s. Proteus, 8(1), 1-2.

Bracey, G.W. (1990). Research: Looking to the experts. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 559-562.

Brandt, R. (1988). On assessment of teaching: A conversation with Lee Shulman. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 44-46.

Bull, B. (1987). Confronting reform in teacher preparation: One state's experience. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 47(1), 25-40.

Clark, J.M. (1989). Reconciliation of data on aptitude test scores and university grades of teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), 49-51.

Cohen, D. (1990). More voices in Babel? Educational research and the politics of curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 518-522.

Conley, S.C. & Bacharach, S.B. (1990). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 539-544.

DiGeronimo, J. (1988). Let's not shortchange the next generation of teachers. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 25.

Dill, V.S. (1990). Support for the unsupportable. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 198-199.

Eastmond, N. (1991). Educational evaluation: The future. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 74-79.

Editor. (1990, Summer). Creating a profession of teaching: The role of national board certification. American Educator, 14 8-12.

Edmonton, P.J. (1990). A normative look at the curriculum in teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(9), 717-722.

Eisele, C. (1990). Too bright to be a teacher educator. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 556-558.

Eisner, E.W. (1990). Who decides what schools teach? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 523-526.

Engel, J.B. (1989). Preserving quality: Teacher training from a liberal arts perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(6), 475-477.

Eubanks, E. & Parish, R. (1990). Why does the status quo persist? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(3), 196-197.

Frisbie, R.D. (1991). New directions in evaluation: A school district perspective. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 46-51.

Ginsberg, R. & Berry, B. (1990). Experiencing school reform: The view from South Carolina. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 549-552.

Glasnapp, D.R. & Poggio, J.P. (1991). Mandated competency testing programs: Evaluating state and local initiatives. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 61-68.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990a). Better teachers for our nation's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(3), 185-194.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990b). Studying the education of educators: From conception to findings. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(9), 698-701.

Greene, J.C. & McClintock, C. (1991). The evolution of evaluation methodology. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 13-21.

Healy, J.M. (1990) Chaos on Sesame Street. American Educator, 14, 22-27,39.

Hockersmith, P. E. (1991). Introduction -- Profiles in teaching: A celebration. Proteus, 8(1), vi-viii.

Hutchings, P. & Marchese, T. (1990). Watching assessment: Questions, stories, prospects. Change, _____, 12-38.

Kagan, D.M. (1991). Builders of wooden boats and the reform of teacher education: A parable. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(9), 675-677.

Katzenmeyer, C.G. (1991). Singing the same old tune: Federal evaluation policy and the program effectiveness panel. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 69-73.

Kennedy, M.M. (1991). Policy issues in teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 72,(9), 659-665.

Lanier, J.E. & Featherstone, J. (1988). A new commitment to teacher education. Educational Leadership, 46,(3), 18-22.

Lewis, A.C. (1990). Getting unstuck: Curriculum as a tool of reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 534-538.

Livingston, C. & Borko, H. (1989). Expert-novice differences in teaching: A cognitive analysis and implications for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), 36-42.

McClenney, K.M. (1990, September/October). Whether assessment? Commitments needed for meaningful change. Change, 22(5), 54.

McKibbin, M.D. (1988). Alternative teacher certification programs. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 32-35.

McNeil, L.M. (1990). Reclaiming a voice: American curriculum scholars and the politics of what is taught in schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 517-518.

Meade, E.J., Jr. (1991). Reshaping the clinical phase of teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(9), 666-669.

Meadows, B.J. (1990). The rewards and risks of shared leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 545-548.

Meek, A. (1988). On teaching as a profession: A conversation with Linda Darling-Hammond. Educational Leadership, 46(3) 11-17.

Millwood, R.E. and Gerlach, G.J. (1991). Assessing prospective teachers. Scholars, 2(2), 1-4.

Nagel, N. (1988). One university's response to teacher education reform. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 23-24.

Opp, R.D. (1989). Freshmen interest in teaching: Recent trends. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), 43-48.

Ory, J.C. (1991). Changes in evaluating teaching in higher education. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 30-36.

Powell, A. (1990). A glimpse at teaching conditions in top private schools. American Educator, 14 28-34, 39.

Ross, D.D. (1989). First steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 22-30.

Roth, R. (1989). The teacher education program: An endangered species? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(4), 319-323.

Schlechty, P.C., Ingwerson, D.W., and Brooks, T.I. (1988). Inventing professional development schools. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 28-31.

Shulman, L.S. (1988). A union of insufficiencies: Strategies for teacher assessment in a period of educational reform. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 36-41.

Simpson, W.A. (1985, Spring). Easing the pain of program review: Departments take the initiative. Educational Record, ____

Skolnik, M.L. (1989). How academic program review can foster intellectual conformity and stifle diversity of thought and method. Journal of Higher Education, 60(6), 619-643.

Smith, M.S., O'Day, J., and Cohen, D.K. (1990). National curriculum American style. American Educator, 14, 10-17, 40-47.

Smyth, J. (1989). Developing sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 12-19.

Sparks-Langer, G.M. & Colton, A.B. (1991). Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective thinking. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 37-43.

Travers, E.F. & Sacks, S.R. (1989). Joining teacher education and the liberal arts in the undergraduate curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(6), 470-474.

Watts, D. (1989). NCATE and Texas eyeball to eyeball: Who will blink? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(4), 311-318.

Weade, G. & Evertson, C.M. (1991). On what can be learned by observing teaching. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 37-45.

Wilson, S. (1990). The secret garden of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 206-209.

Wise, A. (1990). Policies for reforming teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 200-202.

Wisniewski, R. (1990). Let's get on with it. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 195-196.

Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R. (1991). The changing face of educational evaluation. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 3-12.

Conferences, Magazines, Newsletters, and Miscellaneous

ACT Assessment Services. (no date given). Productive assessment via transformative planning and action. Iowa City, IA: Author.

American College Testing Program. (1990). College assessment planning. Iowa City, IA: Author

American College Testing Program. (1991). Guidelines for using CAAP in outcomes assessment. Iowa City, IA: Author.

Barrett, M.E. (1991, August 23-25). If schools fail, reinvent them. USA Weekend, p. 14.

Bauer, J. (1992, June). Rural school administrators split on education reforms. Penn Lines, 27(6), 7.

Blumenstyk, G. & Magner, D.K. (1990, July 11). As assessment draws new converts, backers gather to ask 'what works?' The Chronicle of Higher Education, A11.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). Report card on school reform: The teachers speak. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Carnegie Foundation report a 'blockbuster hit'. (1991, September 30). APSCUF Newsletter, 17(9), 2.

Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.) (1987). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College

Cresap, McCormick, & Paget. (1984). Teacher incentives: A tool effective management. (Research paper for The National Association of Secondary School Principals; The National Association of Elementary School Principals, and The American Association of School Administrators). Reston, VA: Author. Schaffarzick (eds.).

Drexler, J. & Stambaugh, P. (1992, June). Firefight over school reform. Penn Lines, 27(6), 4-7.

Ewell, P.T. (no date given). Assessment and the new accountability: A challenge for higher education's leadership. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Hall, G.E. (1986). Beyond the looking glass: Recommendations and critical warnings for teacher education practitioners, policymakers, and researchers. Austin, TX: The Research & Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas.

Johnson, R., Prus, J., Andersen, C.J., & El-Khawas, E. (1991, May). Assessing assessment: An in-depth status report on the higher education assessment movement in 1990. Higher Education Panel Report #79, Washington, D.C.: American Coucil on Education.

Kaplan, G.R. (1991, May 22). Watch out for America 2000; It really is a crusade. Education Week, 36, 27.

Kodish (ed.). (May, 1991). Creating a Profession of Teaching. APSCUF Newsletter

McKenna, B. (1991a). Teacher education. On Campus, 10(5), 7.

McKenna, B. (1991b). The trials of accreditation. On Campus, 11(2), 8-9, 14.

McMahon, E. (1986). The why, what, and who of assessment: The state perspective. Paper presented at the 47th ETS Invitational Conference at the Plaza, New York City on October 25, 1986. ERIC Reproduction Services, ED 284 892.

Meade, E.J., Jr. (1987). Teaching: A career of choice. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College,

Miller, R.I. (1986). Evaluating institutional quality: Some ways and some problems. Paper presented at OCED's Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education, Special Topic Workshop on "The Role of Evaluation in the Management of Institutions of Higher Education" at Paris, France on May 12-14, 1986.

Moore, J.W. (1987). Panel response to Theodore Sizer. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 8-9.

Nielsen, R. (1991a). Testing: The WYTIWYG factor. On Campus, 10(5), 16.

Nielsen, R. (1991b). Putting the lecture in its place. On Campus, (10(6), 16.

Orlosky, D.E. (Ed.). (1988). Society, schools, and teacher preparation: A report of the commission on the future education of teachers. (Teacher Education Monograph No. 9). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Pitsch, M. (1991a, September 11). School-college links seen as fundamental to education reform. Education Week, 11(2), 1, 12-13.

Pitsch, M. (1991b, September 11). Teacher training a likely focus of higher-ed bill. Education Week, 11(2), 19.

Rothman, R. (1991, September 11). Experts outline assessment systems to track goals. Education Week, 11(2), 18,20.

Sizer, T.R. (1987a). Response to the panelists. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 15-17.

Sizer, T.R. (1987b). The connection between teacher education and school reform. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on

37 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 1-7.

Spady, W. (1991-1992). The real meaning of outcome-based. The Mainstream, 9(3), p. 2.

Steele, J.M. (no date given). Distinguishing differences: College outcome measures program. American College Testing Program.

Students rank high on national exam. (1991, October 4). FACT, Shippensburg University, 2(16), p. 5.

Tom, A. R. (1987). What are the fundamental problems in the professional education of teachers. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 28-33.

Travers, E.F. & Sacks, S.R. (1987). Teacher education and the liberal arts: The position of the consortium for excellence in teacher education. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 34-38.

Walsh, M. (1991, May 22). Entrepreneur Whittle unveils plans to create chain of for-profit schools. Education Week, pp. 1, 14.

Appendix A

Program Quality Assessment Survey in Teacher Education in Pennsylvania

PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT SURVEY IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

Appendix A

Part I: Program Evaluation

Please indicate if the following factors figure into teacher education program evaluation. Select your answers to each statement by placing checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable.

		Elem		Sec	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1.	A faculty committee or other governance body evaluates courses within the teacher education programs.				
2.	There is a set of policy guidelines for evaluating teacher education courses.				
3.	Faculty evaluations are used to evaluate the quality of the teacher education programs.				
4.	Student evaluations of courses are used to evaluate teacher education programs.				
5.	Student grade distributions are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs.				
6.	Measures of students' abilities in the following areas are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:				
	• organize or formulate curriculum				
	• make subject matter comprehensible to learner				
	• adapt content and instruction to learners				
	• assess learning				
	• use assessment to organize instruction				
	• work with students of diverse backgrounds				
	• set goals for continuing professional development				
7.	Program evaluations incorporate data from the following areas:				
	• graduation ratios				
	• employment ratios				
	• students' performances on exit exams other than the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Test				
	• student exit interviews				
	• student portfolios				

8. Feedback from the following professionals is used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:

	Elem		Sec	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
* graduates of the program				
* teachers in the field with whom the student teachers worked				
* school district administrators				

Please state any other sources _____

Part II: Admissions

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable. **Note: Some items in Question 10 ask for additional information.**

	Elem		Sec	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
9. The institution has an open admissions policy.				

10. The following criteria are used to admit students to the university or college:

	Elem			Sec		
	Required	No	Optional	Required	No	Optional
* Scholastic Aptitude Test combined score or American College Testing score [minimum score accepted _____]						
* high school class standing [minimum rank _____]						
* admissions interview						
* high school grade point average [minimum grade _____]						
* portfolios of student's high school work						
* other, please identify _____						

11. Which of the following are used to determine entrance into teacher education programs:

	Elem		Sec	
	Incoming	Transfers	Incoming	Transfers
* grade point average between 2.0 - 2.49 (4.0 scale)				
* grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)				
* approval by Dean of Education or appropriate official				
* interview committee				
* other, please identify _____				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Part III: **Student Teaching Prerequisites**

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the Elementary and or Secondary program columns that are applicable.

12. Student performance requirements for admission into student teaching include the following:

	Elem		Sec	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
* an overall grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)				
* at least a 2.0 or better in all required courses (4.0 scale)				
* at least a 2.0 in all professional education courses (4.0 scale)				
* pre-student teaching field experiences				
* acceptable scores on a standardized test				
* other, please identify _____				

Part IV: **Institutional Information**

Select your answer to the question and place checkmarks in the appropriate column.

13. What combined score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test is used as a cutoff score for admission to the college or university?

A	B	C	D	E

A) not applicable
B) above 1200
C) 1199-950
D) 949-800
E) open admissions

Please identify other tests and cutoff scores used.

_____

14. What was the institution's total average percentage for the last three years of teacher education majors who have passed all four sections on the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests?

A	B	C	D	E

A) above 98%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%

A	B	C	D	E

15. Of those who graduate from your teacher education programs, what is the average percentage of employment within the field of teaching in the last three years?

A) above 95%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%

Part V: **Perceptions**

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the "Respondent" and "Perceived Faculty Opinions" columns. **Note: This section involves your perceptions and your perceived opinions of your faculty.**

	Respondent					Perceived Faculty Opinion				
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	C	D	E
16. How significantly does the NCATE process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?										
17. How significantly does the Middle States process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?										
18. How significantly does the Pennsylvania Department of Education process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?										

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

Respondent				
A	B	C	D	E

Perceived Faculty Opinion				
A	B	C	D	E

19. How significantly does an internal self-study process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

20. How would you rate the National Teacher Exam or Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests as a valid indicator of the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A	B	C	D	E

A	B	C	D	E

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

21. Review the factors below with respect to their contributions to the quality of teacher education programs. Indicate the importance of each factor by rating it according to the following five point scale: (1) very important, (2) important, (3) moderately important, (4) slightly important, (5) not important.

_____ A) motivation and desire of the students

_____ B) program curriculum

_____ C) overall grade point average of the students

_____ D) grade point average in the students' major

_____ E) student teaching grade or performance (if on pass/fail)

_____ F) academic credentials of the education faculty

_____ G) academic quality of faculty instruction

_____ H) induction program within school districts

_____ I) evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE

_____ J) collaboration with school districts

_____ K) class size

_____ L) articulation across program components: i.e., general education, arts and sciences, professional education, field experience/student teaching.

Part VI: **Comments**

Please use this space to identify or further explain any other facets of how the education profession assesses or determines the quality of teacher education programs.

Appendix B

Letter to Pennsylvania Colleges and Universities From Pennsylvania Academy

PENNSYLVANIA ACADEMY
for the PROFESSION of TEACHING

6 August 1991

1~

Dear 2~,

The Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching is initiating a project to examine issues related to the assessment of program quality in teacher education. The intention of this project is to engage those involved in teacher preparation in a dialogue about these issues which will, in turn, contribute to improved program assessment policies and practices.

Unlike a number of other states across the country Pennsylvania does not have a legislatively mandated program assessment in place. This poses a significant opportunity for those of us in the field to generate program assessments which take into account the myriad factors that contribute to a program's quality and which are supportive of ongoing program quality enhancement.

For a number of years program inputs have been used as the primary indices of program quality. Over the last two decades evidence of prospective teachers' ability to demonstrate specific discrete behaviors and/or knowledge recall have been folded into the program assessment mix. More recently, issues related to teachers' judgement, ability to apply knowledge and skills, and facility with negotiating the complexities of the classroom have emerged as salient dimensions of program assessment. Measuring these qualities and relating their presence in teacher candidates back to programs is nothing if not a complex tricky, and, as yet, unresolved business. Yet it seems compelling to persevere.

The attached survey questionnaire is being sent to a sample of deans and directors of teacher education programs throughout the Commonwealth. Results of the survey will be used to inform the broader community of teacher educators about representative features of current program assessment practice. The results also will be used to stimulate the dialogue about program assessment. Your responses are critical to building a realistic picture of current practice in this area. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. The questionnaires are coded for identification so that follow-up telephone interviews might be done.

Please complete and return the attached questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope by 5 September 1991. Feel free to call me if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Gendernalik Cooper
Project Director

Enclosure

State System of Higher Education • University Center
2986 North Second Street • Harrisburg, PA 17110
717-787-9565 • FAX 717-787-0869

Appendix C

Responses to Survey Instrument

PROGRAM QUALITY ASSESSMENT SURVEY IN TEACHER EDUCATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

Part I: Program Evaluation - Responses Appendix C

Please indicate if the following factors figure into teacher education program evaluation. Select your answers to each statement by placing checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable. **Percentages do not add to 100 in some cases because of no response or rounding off.**

	ELEMENTARY N=21			SECONDARY N=23		
	YES	NO	NR	YES	NO	NR
1. A faculty committee or other governance body evaluates courses within the teacher education programs.	19 90%	2 10%		21 91%	2 9%	
2. There is a set of policy guidelines for evaluating teacher education courses.	15 71%	6 29%		17 74%	6 26%	
3. Faculty evaluations are used to evaluate the quality of the teacher education programs.	16 76%	5 24%		18 78%	5 22%	
4. Student evaluations of courses are used to evaluate teacher education programs.	19 90%	2 10%		21 91%	2 9%	
5. Student grade distributions are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs.	8 38%	13 62%		9 39%	14 61%	
6. Measures of stucents' abilities in the following areas are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:						
* organize or formulate curriculum	19 90%	2 10%		21 91%	2 9%	
* make subject matter comprehensible to learner	20 95%	1 5%		21 91%	2 9%	
* adapt content and instruction to learners	20 95%	1 5%		22 96%	1 4%	
* assess learning	20 95%	1 5%		22 96%	1 4%	
* use assessment to organize instruction	20 95%	1 5%		22 96%	1 4%	
* work with students of diverse backgrounds	19 90%	2 10%		20 87%	3 13%	
* set goals for continuing professional development	14 67%	7 33%		16 70%	7 30%	
7. Program evaluations incorporate data from the following areas:						
* graduation ratios	12 57%	8 38%	1 5%	15 65%	7 30%	1 4%
* employment ratios	17 81%	4 19%		19 83%	4 17%	
* students' performances on exit exams other than the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Test	9 43%	12 57%		10 43%	13 57%	
* student exit interviews	12 57%	9 43%		13 57%	10 43%	
* student portfolios	8 38%	13 62%		10 43%	13 57%	

8. **Feedback from the following professionals is used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:**

	ELEMENTARY N=21			SECONDARY N=23		
	YES	NO	NR	YES	NO	NR
* graduates of the program	20 95%	1 5%		23 100		
* teachers in the field with whom the student teachers worked	21 100			23 100		
* school district administrators	18 86%	3 14%		20 87%	3 13%	
Please state any other sources	7 33%	14 67%		7 30%	16 70%	

Part II: Admissions

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable. **Note: Some items in Question 10 ask for additional information.**

9. The institution has an open admissions policy.

Elem N=21	
Yes	No
1 5%	20 95%

Sec. N=23	
Yes	No
2 9%	21 91%

10. The following criteria are used to admit students to the university or college:

	ELEMENTARY N=21				SECONDARY N=23			
	Req.	No.	Opt.	NR / NA	Req.	No.	Opt.	NR / NA
* Scholastic Aptitude Test combined score or American College Testing score [minimum score accepted _____] Elm 1 used ACT Sec 13 SAT 12 Used SAT 10 NR	18 86%	2 10%	1 5%		20 87%	1 4%	2 9%	
* high school class standing [minimum rank _____]	17 81%	2 10%		2 10%	20 87%	2 9%		1 4%
* admissions interview	8 38%	3 14%	9 43%	1 5%	8 35%	3 13%	12 52%	
* high school grade point average [minimum grade _____]	12 57%	2 10%	4 19%	3 14%	15 65%	2 9%	3 13%	3 13%
* portfolios of student's high school work	4 19%	10 48%	4 19%	3 14%	4 18%	12 52%	5 22%	2 9%
* other, please identify	5 24%	16 76%			7 30%	16 70%		

11. Which of the following are used to determine entrance into teacher education programs:

	Elementary N=21		Secondary N=23	
	Response	No Response	Response	No Response
* grade point average between 2.0 - 2.49 (4.0 scale)	3 14%	16 86%	5 22%	18 78%
* grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)	16 76%	5 24%	17 74%	6 26%
* approval by Dean of Education or appropriate official	14 67%	7 33%	16 70%	7 30%
* interview committee	5 24%	16 76%	7 30%	16 70%
* other, please identify	9 43%	12 57%	9 39%	14 61%

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable.

12. Student performance requirements for admission into student teaching include the following:

	ELEMENTARY N=21			SECONDARY N=23		
	YES	NO	NA	YES	NO	NA
* an overall grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)	17 81%	4 19%		19 83%	4 17%	
* at least a 2.0 or better in all required courses (4.0 scale)	15 71%	2 10%	4 19%	16 70%	3 13%	4 17%
* at least a 2.0 in all professional education courses (4.0 scale)	16 76%	1 5%	4 19%	17 74%	2 9%	4 17%
* pre-student teaching field experiences	20 95%	1 5%		22% 96%	1 4%	
* acceptable scores on a standardized test	5 24%	12 57%	4 19%	6 26%	13 57%	4 17%
* other, please identify	6 29%	15 71%		6 26%	17 74%	

Part IV: **Institutional Information**

Select your answer to the question and place checkmarks in the appropriate column.

13. What combined score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test is used as a cutoff score for admission to the college or university?

	N=23					
	A	B	C	D	E	NR
	9 39%	1 4%	5 22%	6 26%	1 4%	1 4%

A) not applicable
B) above 1200
C) 1199-950
D) 949-800
E) open admissions

Please identify other tests and cutoff scores used.

22=96% no 1=4% yes

14. What was the institution's total average percentage for the last three years of teacher education majors who have passed all four sections on the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests?

A	B	C	D	E	NR
7 30%	9 39%	5 22%	1 4%	0	1 4%

A) above 98%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%

15. Of those who graduate from your teacher education programs, what is the average percentage of employment within the field of teaching in the last three years?

A	B	C	D	E	NR
1	3	5	5	9	
4%	13%	22%	22%	39%	

A) above 95%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%

Part V: Perceptions

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the "Respondent" and "Perceived Faculty Opinions" columns. **Note: This section involves your perceptions and your perceived opinions of your faculty.**

16. How significantly does the NCATE process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

RESPONDENT N=23

A	B	C	D	E	NR
10	2	5	2	4	
43%	9%	22%	9%	17%	

PERCEIVED FACULTY OPINION N=23

A	B	C	D	E	NR
10	4	5	4		
43%	17%	22%	17%		

17. How significantly does the Middle States process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

A	B	C	D	E	NR
1	7	9	4	2	
4%	30%	39%	17%	9%	

A	B	C	D	E	NR
1	8	8	5	1	
4%	35%	35%	22%	4%	

18. How significantly does the Pennsylvania Department of Education process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

A	B	C	D	E	NR
	2	4	9	8	
	9%	17%	39%	35%	

A	B	C	D	E	NR
	4	4	6	9	
	17%	17%	26%	39%	

19. How significantly does an internal self-study process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

RESPONDENT N=23					
A	B	C	D	E	NR
		3 13%	10 44%	10 44%	

PERCEIVED FACULTY OPINION N=23					
A	B	C	D	E	NR
	1 4%	3 13%	7 30%	11 48%	1 4%

20. How would you rate the National Teacher Exam or Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests as a valid indicator of the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

A	B	C	D	E	NR
5 22%	6 26%	9 39%	2 9%		1 4%

A	B	C	D	E	NR
4 17%	7 30%	8 35%	3 13%		1 4%

21. Review the factors below with respect to their contributions to the quality of teacher education programs. Indicate the importance of each factor by rating it according to the following five point scale: (1) very important, (2) important, (3) moderately important, (4) slightly important, (5) not important. **Mean values are:**

1.22 A) motivation and desire of the students

1.17 B) program curriculum

2.30 C) overall grade point average of the students

1.87 D) grade point average in the students' major

1.83 E) student teaching grade or performance (if on pass/fail)

1.61 F) academic credentials of the education faculty

1.09 G) academic quality of faculty instruction

2.96 H) induction program within school districts

2.91 I) evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE

1.87 J) collaboration with school districts

2.13 K) class size — 8 (35%) Responded; 15 (65%) No response

1.22 L) articulation across program components: i.e., general education, arts and sciences, professional education, field experience/student teaching.

Mean N=23		Rank
A	1.22	3
B	1.17	2
C	2.30	10
D	1.87	7.5
E	1.83	6
F	1.61	5
G	1.09	1
H	2.96	12
I	2.91	11
J	1.87	7.5
K	2.13	9
L	1.52	4

Appendix D

Comments From Respondents

APPENDIX D

Comments From Respondents

Although we are not doing anything with portfolios at the moment they appear to have some value in the assessment process. The new tests being prepared by NTE are evidently going to be more performance based and that move should have a dramatic effect on program assessment as well as instructional practice. Frankly, I would like to see some kind of intern experience similar to that experienced by doctors but the sheer magnitude of teacher education programs is a problem.

At IUP we have been trying to evaluate critical qualities of candidates. In our pre-teacher assessment program we are able to pinpoint these qualities very accurately. We also have departmentally developed evaluation processes at the junior level that includes an interview, specific grade requirements and in some cases a proficiency exam.

I was highly displeased with the PA Dept. of Education review process. Surely there's a better way.

We are in the process of developing a more formal procedure for evaluating and screening candidates throughout the four years of our undergraduate training program. I cannot share the specifics of this procedure at this time. Our Special Education/Elementary Education Program has been evaluated recently by a National Inquiry Team sponsored by the Council for Exceptional Children (National Organization)

Comparison with research findings

Penn State is pleased that more of our students later earn doctorates than most places. This is fine for a research institution but it doesn't speak to the quality of the teacher preparation. We need to do more systematic assessment of employers of our students, but in the last ten years up to half our students annually accept positions outside Pennsylvania. I'd like to involve more teachers in evaluation, perhaps mentors in the induction program.

The greatest problem is resources: time and staff. Teacher Ed. Programs don't budget for continuous program

evaluation. Currently, rising enrollment is strapping all of us just to meet student demand.

The rest of the institution doesn't worry about evaluating teacher education programs because they already "know" that they are poor and not particularly worthy, though they have no real evidence of that. For example, we demonstrated that our Secondary Ed. Students' SATs and GPAs are equivalent to others in the University, but our colleagues refuse to accept that because they "know" that teacher ed. students are worse than others.

Although we are working very diligently in improving our students' scores on the NTE, I believe that the mandatory taking of the NTE is expensive and is not an indicator of how well a student will do as a teacher. I think the money the state spent on the test and the dollars spent by students is an exercise in futility. (As it pertains to making/creating good teachers)

The determining factors in teacher education quality is the product, the student who becomes a stellar teacher.

This past year we had a one hundred percent passing of the NTE.

1) Institutional, state, and national assessment programs need to be integrated to avoid redundancy.

2) Program graduates need to be assessed during their first 2-3 years in the profession.

3) SCDEs need to increase personnel and budgets to support more meaningful assessments.

4) All teacher educators should be required to complete at least one graduate course on the assessment of teaching and teacher education.

While the data you are collecting will be of some interest, I do not believe it addresses the fundamental problem in teacher education. That is, what empirical evidence is available (data collected from controlled experimentation) which demonstrates that the teaching of methods -- eg. how to teach the elementary vs secondary child; how to teach social studies vs science; how to teach the gifted vs the retarded -- is effective in _____

_____ effective teachers. We treat the methods approach as an _____ _____ (the way to prepare teachers) and have for the past 50 years. Yet there is research to believe that all of these courses are based upon an **erroneous** assumption. That is, we can design meaningful courses for teaching people classified on a single variable. When we feel all of us differ _____ on several variables which _____ be taken into account for evaluation to be effective. We have addressed this issue and have some interesting results. Until we are willing to admit that our basic approach to teacher education has been faulty, it is real likely (unlikely) that significant changes will occur. Rather, what we will find (as we have in the past) is that the **only** significant predictor of teacher effectiveness are personal characteristics of the student and their academic performance -- not what they have learned in existing prof. educ. courses. Assessment, which is limited to products of flawed approaches to teacher education, will do little to enhance the quality of teacher education.

I will be happy to talk further with you if you are interested.

Sincerely,

William Moore
Bucknell Univ.
(717) 524-1324